1	BEFORE THE							
2	ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION							
3	IN THE MATTER OF:							
4	STATE OF ILLINOIS, DEPARTMENT) OF TRANSPORTATION,)							
5)							
6	vs.) No. T10-0177							
7	BURLINGTON NORTHERN and SANTA) FE RAILWAY COMPANY (BNSF); and) the CITY OF AURORA,)							
8	Petition to establish the							
9	interconnection of Railroad) warning signal system and)							
10	traffic control signal system) devices at the grade crossing)							
11	of Illinois Avenue and BNSF's) tracks in the City of Aurora,)							
12	Kane County, Illinois.							
13	Chigaga Illinois							
14	Chicago, Illinois April 19, 2011							
15	Met, pursuant to notice, at Chicago.							
16	BEFORE:							
17	TIMOTHY E. DUGGAN, Administrative Law Judge via videoconference							
18								
19	APPEARANCES:							
20	MR. LANCE JONES via videoconference 2300 South Dirksen Parkway Springfield, Illinois 62764							
21	(217) 782-2315 for the State of Illinois, Department of							
22	Transportation;							

Τ	MR. ROBERT J. PRENDERGAST							
2	55 West Monroe Street							
3	Suite 1600 Chicago, Illinois 60603 (312) 422-9999							
4	for BNSF Railway Company;							
5	ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION, by MR. BRIAN VERCRUYSSE 527 East Capitol Avenue Springfield, Illinois 62701							
6								
7	(630) 424-8750 for ICC Staff.							
8								
9	ALSO PRESENT:							
10	MR. FRENCH THOMPSON, BNSF manager of public projects							
11	projects							
12								
13	SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by Alisa A. Sawka, CSR, RPR License No. 084-004588							
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								

1			<u>I</u> <u>N</u> <u>I</u>	<u>E</u> <u>X</u>		
2		.	a	Re-		
3	Witnesses:	Direct	Cross	direct	cross	Examiner
4	None.					
5						
6						
7						
8						
9		<u>E</u>	<u>X</u> <u>H</u> <u>I</u>	<u>B</u> <u>I</u> <u>T</u> <u>S</u>	<u> </u>	
10	Number			ficatio		<u> In Evidence</u>
11	None.					
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						

- 1 JUDGE DUGGAN: Pursuant to the authority vested
- 2 in me by the State of Illinois and the Illinois
- 3 Commerce Commission, I now call Docket T10-0177 for
- 4 hearing.
- 5 May we have appearances for the
- 6 record, starting with the Petitioner.
- 7 MR. JONES: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. Lance
- 8 Jones, Deputy Chief Counsel Illinois Department of
- 9 Transportation. The address is 2300 South Dirksen
- 10 Parkway, Springfield, Illinois 62764. Telephone
- 11 number is (217) 782-2315.
- 12 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. And for BNSF.
- 13 MR. PRENDERGAST: Yes, Bob Prendergast,
- 14 P-r-e-n-d-e-r-q-a-s-t, the law firm Daly Mohan
- 15 Groble, address is 55 West Monroe Street, Suite 1600,
- 16 Chicago, Illinois 60603. My phone is (312)422-0799,
- 17 and I'm here on behalf of the BNSF. And Mr. French
- 18 Thompson, manager of public projects, is here today
- 19 as well.
- 20 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Commission Staff.
- 21 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Thank you, your Honor. Brian
- 22 Vercruysse, V-e-r-c-r-u-y-s-s-e, representing Staff

- 1 of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Phone number is
- 2 (312) 636-7760. That's it. Thank you.
- 3 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. We're here today on the
- 4 Department of Transportation's Petition to establish
- 5 an interconnect system in the City of Aurora and Kane
- 6 County. We had a hearing on April 7th at which time
- 7 Exhibits 1 through 5 were admitted into evidence by
- 8 agreement, I believe.
- 9 Since that time, the Department of
- 10 Transportation has filed an amended application
- 11 substituting the City of Aurora for Kane County.
- 12 That -- I issued an Administrative Law Judge ruling
- 13 granting leave to amend and granting the motion to
- 14 dismiss Kane County and substitute the City of
- 15 Aurora.
- 16 The City of Aurora obviously had no
- 17 prior chance to participate and this is the City of
- 18 Aurora's chance to participate. Nobody has appeared
- 19 here today on behalf of the City of Aurora.
- 20 I believe Staff has represented that
- 21 you've been in contact with them and they are in
- 22 agreement with the Petition. Is that correct,

- 1 Mr. Vercruysse?
- MR. VERCRUYSSE: That's correct, your Honor.
- 3 On Monday, March 21st the City of Aurora through
- 4 their traffic engineer, Eric Gault, had provided his
- 5 concurrence through e-mail concurring to the agreed
- 6 order and IDOT's Amended Petition.
- 7 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Now, at that time he
- 8 didn't reference what constituted the Agreed Order.
- 9 Was that prior to March 16th, that e-mail?
- 10 MR. VERCRUYSSE: The March 16th, 2011 date was
- 11 when Staff, myself, had provided a draft agreed order
- 12 to all parties. His response was to that agreed
- order based upon his date of March 21st responding to
- 14 me.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. And, in fact, you filed
- 16 that Agreed Order on the Commission e-Docket on
- 17 March 16, 2011; is that correct?
- MR. VERCRUYSSE: Correct, your Honor.
- 19 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. I believe that the
- 20 parties present have come to agreement on a
- 21 sufficient number of facts that I can issue an order.
- 22 Obviously, we can't have a fully agreed order as

- 1 Aurora's not here. And for various reasons I'll be
- 2 drafting an order and sending out a proposed order so
- 3 all parties will have a chance to have further input.
- 4 But as far as making the record to have the evidence
- 5 in the record from which to determine the facts and
- 6 make the findings and orderings necessary, we need to
- 7 have those facts on record.
- 8 So I believe the process that I've
- 9 suggested is that we're going to take
- 10 Mr. Vercruysse's -- the draft order that was posted
- on the e-Docket on March 16th, 2011, and make that an
- 12 exhibit -- a physical exhibit that, I suggest, would
- 13 be the joint exhibit of IDOT, BNSF and Staff. And
- 14 that we then take stipulations to that -- to the
- 15 factual representations as stated in that agreement
- 16 as being true and correct and also to the findings
- 17 and conclusions -- the agreement to those findings
- 18 and conclusions.
- Does anybody have an objection to that
- 20 procedure?
- MR. JONES: No, your Honor.
- MR. PRENDERGAST: No, I have not.

- 1 MR. VERCRUYSSE: No objection, your Honor.
- 2 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Then can each of you tell
- 3 me that you would like to present a true and correct
- 4 copy of the agreed order filed on e-Docket on
- 5 March 16, 2011, in this docket as your joint exhibit
- 6 in this cause?
- 7 Mr. Jones?
- 8 MR. JONES: On behalf of the Department, yes,
- 9 your Honor.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast?
- MR. PRENDERGAST: On behalf of BNSF, yes.
- 12 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Staff?
- MR. VERCRUYSSE: Yes, your Honor. On behalf of
- 14 Staff, yes.
- 15 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Thank you.
- 16 Now, can each of you tell me that you
- 17 stipulate to the factual representations within that
- 18 draft agreed order, such that if evidence -- good and
- 19 competent evidence were presented in hearing under
- 20 oath that, in fact, the testimony would support those
- 21 as the facts?
- 22 Mr. Jones?

- 1 MR. JONES: On behalf of the Department, the
- 2 Department so stipulates.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast?
- 4 MR. PRENDERGAST: BNSF so stipulates.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Vercruysse?
- 6 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Yes. Staff so stipulates
- 7 also.
- 8 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. And can each of you state
- 9 your stipulation that you agree that the findings
- 10 stated in the draft order are properly based upon
- 11 such factual basis as previously just stipulated to?
- 12 Mr. Jones?
- MR. JONES: Yes, the Department agrees that the
- 14 Commission's findings and conclusions are accurate.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Mr. Prendergast?
- 16 MR. PRENDERGAST: BNSF agrees that they are
- 17 accurate as well.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Vercruysse?
- 19 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Staff also agrees that the
- 20 findings and conclusions are accurate.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. And with regard to the
- ordering paragraphs stated in the draft order, do

- each of you agree to the terms stated therein?
- 2 Mr. Jones?
- 3 MR. JONES: On behalf of the Department, yes,
- 4 we agree.
- 5 JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast?
- 6 MR. PRENDERGAST: On behalf of BNSF, we agree.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Vercruysse?
- 8 MR. VERCRUYSSE: On behalf of Staff, we agree.
- 9 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. And with that let's also
- 10 mention that there are going to be some known
- 11 changes, some procedural, none that are not based
- 12 upon the evidence simply as previously stipulated to,
- 13 but that we will review quickly to make sure that
- 14 there's no misunderstanding here or that things are
- 15 not stated in an imprecise fashion to give a false
- 16 impressionism.
- 17 The first of those would be that under
- 18 the section of stipulated agreed facts after the
- 19 sentence that refers to the Route 25 intersection I
- 20 would insert a sentence stating -- very similar to
- 21 Finding 9 -- that IDOT has agreed to be responsible
- 22 for construction and maintenance costs associated

- 1 with the traffic signal modifications and
- 2 interconnect as outlined in the master agreement
- 3 between the City of Aurora and IDOT, period.
- 4 Now, can you all agree that that would
- 5 be a fair representation of the facts to be added to
- 6 the prefatory portion of the agreement?
- 7 Mr. Jones?
- 8 MR. JONES: Yes, your Honor. The Department
- 9 agrees and so stipulates.
- 10 JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast?
- MR. PRENDERGAST: BNSF agrees and so
- 12 stipulates.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: And Mr. Vercruysse?
- MR. VERCRUYSSE: Staff agrees also.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. And then above the
- 16 Respondent's position section, four lines up, the
- 17 draft order refers to IDOT finalized traffic signal
- 18 plans for the interconnect with Commission approval.
- 19 I believe we've clarified that the intention with
- that would be not the entire Commerce Commission, the
- 21 Commissioners, but Commission Staff approval. And
- that I will revise the order accordingly.

- 1 Is that agreed, Mr. Jones?
- 2 MR. JONES: Yes, that's agreeable to the
- 3 Department.
- 4 JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast?
- 5 MR. PRENDERGAST: That's agreeable to BNSF.
- 6 JUDGE DUGGAN: And, Mr. Vercruysse?
- 7 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Staff agrees, your Honor.
- 8 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Then going on to the
- 9 finding paragraphs in Paragraph 6, which states that
- 10 IDOT should be authorized to interconnect the traffic
- 11 signals at the subject crossing, in addition to the
- 12 typed sentence on the draft agreed order, I will add
- 13 the following language: Consistent with a traffic
- 14 signal plan as finalized by IDOT with Commission
- 15 Staff approval.
- Is that agreed, Mr. Jones?
- MR. PRENDERGAST: Yes, that's agreeable to the
- 18 Department.
- 19 JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast?
- 20 MR. JONES: BNSF agrees to that.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: And, Mr. Vercruysse?
- 22 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Staff also agrees, your Honor.

- 1 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Then on Paragraph 7 we
- 2 will change, "BSNF should install" to "BNSF should
- 3 install and then insert, comma, at the Illinois
- 4 Avenue Crossing, comma. Then proceed with the
- 5 present language ending with "32 seconds of
- 6 simultaneous preemption warning time." Then add the
- 7 following, comma, "and IDOT should be responsible for
- 8 all construction costs associated with the
- 9 installation of such light signals, comma, gates and
- 10 circuitry and BNSF should be responsible for future
- 11 maintenance and associated costs, " period. Basically
- 12 taking the language of Paragraph 10 and adding that
- 13 to 7 for the purpose of removing any ambiguity about
- 14 which warning device improvements were referred to in
- 15 Paragraph 10 -- excuse me -- Finding 10.
- Is that agreeable, Mr. Jones?
- MR. JONES: Yes, the Department agrees.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast, is that
- 19 agreeable?
- 20 MR. PRENDERGAST: Yes, your Honor, BNSF agrees
- 21 as well.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: And, Mr. Vercruysse?

- 1 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Staff agrees also, your Honor.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Thank you.
- And then on Paragraph 9, it would
- 4 insert -- back where it says, "IDOT should be
- 5 responsible regarding the traffic signal
- 6 modifications and interconnect," at that point we'll
- 7 insert, comma, "other than as provided in Finding 7."
- Is that agreeable, Mr. Jones?
- 9 MR. JONES: Yes, it's agreeable with the
- 10 Department.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Is that agreeable,
- 12 Mr. Prendergast?
- MR. PRENDERGAST: It's agreeable with BNSF,
- 14 your Honor.
- 15 JUDGE DUGGAN: Thank you.
- And, Mr. Vercruysse?
- 17 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Staff agrees, your Honor.
- 18 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. And then since that --
- 19 those last few changes were all to clarify Finding 10
- 20 by moving them to those -- or moving the essence of
- 21 it to Finding 7, I will delete Finding 10.
- Is that agreeable with Mr. Jones?

- 1 MR. JONES: Yes, the Department agrees.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast?
- 3 MR. PRENDERGAST: BNSF agrees.
- 4 JUDGE DUGGAN: And, Mr. Vercruysse?
- 5 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Staff agrees.
- 6 JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Then the third ordering
- 7 paragraph since there are now -- since we moved
- 8 Finding 10 there are now 15 findings rather than 16,
- 9 so I would remove "16" and insert "15" there. And I
- 10 would also add after -- at the end of the third
- ordering paragraph, "including the allocation of
- 12 responsibilities for installation, comma, maintenance
- and costs thereof, as stated in such findings,"
- 14 period.
- Is that agreeable, Mr. Jones?
- 16 MR. JONES: Yes, that's agreeable to the
- 17 Department.
- 18 JUDGE DUGGAN: Is that agreeable,
- 19 Mr. Prendergast?
- 20 MR. PRENDERGAST: BNSF agrees, your Honor.
- JUDGE DUGGAN: And that's agreeable with
- 22 Mr. Vercruysse?

```
1 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Yes, your Honor.
```

- JUDGE DUGGAN: Okay. Are there any other
- 3 matters?
- 4 MR. JONES: The Department has no other matters
- 5 to raise.
- 6 JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Prendergast?
- 7 MR. PRENDERGAST: BNSF has nothing further,
- 8 your Honor.
- 9 JUDGE DUGGAN: Mr. Vercruysse?
- 10 MR. VERCRUYSSE: Staff has nothing, your Honor.
- 11 JUDGE DUGGAN: All right. Thank you very much.
- 12 I will get a proposed order out and the record will
- 13 be marked heard and taken. Thank you.
- 14 (Heard and taken.)
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22